



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,597	03/06/2001	Stephen J. Turner	063170.2356	2673

7590

11/05/2003

Terry J. Stalford, Esq.  
Baker & Botts, L.L.P.  
Suite 600  
2001 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, TX 75201

EXAMINER

ZHEN, WEI Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/800,597

Applicant(s)

TURNER ET AL.

Examiner

Wei Y Zhen

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filed 8/13/2003.
2. Claims 25-49 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 25, 30-34, 36-37, 38, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozuka et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,845,119 in view of Bharadwaj, U.S. Patent No. 5,787,287.

As per claim 25, Kozuka et al discloses providing a first exiting module and a second existing module (Fig. 2 source code file 111); determining a first operation associated with the first existing module, determining a second operation associated with the second existing module; determining a mapping between the first and second operations and managing an interaction between the first and second operations based on the mapping...substantially as claimed (col. 3 line 56 to col. 4 line 60).

Kozuka et al does not explicitly disclose the module is executable module.

However, Bharadwaj discloses determining the interactions between executable code (Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Bharadwaj into the teaching of Kozuka et al to have the module be

Art Unit: 2122

executable module. The modification would have been obvious because one would want to be able to be able to determine the interactions in executable module to analyze the software application.

As per claim 30, Kozuka et al discloses specifying an intermediate representation of information for communication between the first and second operations (col. 4 line 39 to col. 6 line 20).

As per claim 31, Kozuka et al discloses the intermediate representation in associated with a user interface (col. 5 lines 21-46).

As per claim 32, Kozuka et al discloses the intermediate representation...substantially as claimed (col. 5 lines 21-46).

As per claim 33, Kozuka et al discloses determining how a parameter associated with the first operation flows to the second operation (col. 4 line 39 to col. 6 line 20).

As per claim 34, Kozuka et al discloses managing a data value...substantially as claimed (col. 4 line 39 to col. 6 line 20).

As per claim 36, Kozuka et al discloses the first operation has an associated field...generating a characteristic...as claimed (col. 4 line 39 to col. 6 line 20).

As per claim 37, Kozuka et al discloses determining a declarative mapping...as claimed (col. 4 line 39 to col. 6 line 20).

Claims 38, 43, 44, 46, 47 are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejections of claims 25, 30, 33, 36, 37 respectively.

Claim 48 is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 25.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35, 45, 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozuka et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,845,119 in view of Bharadwaj, U.S. Patent No. 5,787,287 further in view of Warren et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,632,022.

As per claim 35, Kozuka et al does not explicitly disclose an output parameter and an input parameter as claimed.

However, Warren et al disclose an output and an input (col. 16 lines 59-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Warren et al into the system of Kozuka et al to have an input and an output as claimed because it provides an efficient method to analyze the interdependencies between components.

Claim 45 is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 35.

Claim 49 is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejections of claims 25, 27, 28, 29, 34, 35.

5. Claims 26-29, 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozuka et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,845,119 in view of Bharadwaj, U.S. Patent No. 5,787,287.

As per claims 26, 28, 29, Kozuka et al does not explicitly disclose managing runtime interaction between executable component objects.

Official Notice is taken that managing runtime interaction between executable component objects was well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching the well known knowledge into the system of Kozuka et al to manage runtime interaction between executable component objects because it provides an efficient method to analyze the interdependencies between the objects.

As per claim 27, Kozuka et al disclose forming an object based application (Abstract).

Claims 39-42 are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejections of claims 26-29 respectively.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2122

*Conclusion*

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wei Zhen whose telephone number is (703)305-0437.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Greg Morse can be reached at (703) 308-4789. The fax numbers for this group are (703)746-7239 (official fax), (703)746-7240 (non-official/draft), (703)746-7238 (after-final).

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-9600.



Wei Zhen

Primary Patent Examiner

10/30/2003